

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the Office Action, the Examiner required affirmation of the election made during the March 21, 2006 telephone conversation between the Examiner and the undersigned. Such confirmation is hereby given.

In the Office Action, the Examiner indicated that the listing of references in the specification was not a proper information disclosure statement. An IDS supplying all materials referenced in the specification along with additional references, is submitted herewith.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 6 - 10 under 35 USC 112, 2nd paragraph, as being indefinite. In making this rejection, the Examiner indicated that the claims and the specification refer to "R" without defining the structure. The Examiner further indicated that for purposes of examination, "R" is read to be "hydrogen" or any carbon based radical. Applicant concurs with the Examiner's interpretation. The Examiner further noted that the claims and specification refer to "flexible cyclic molecules" but the bounds of the phrase is unclear. For the purpose of examination the Examiner indicated that the phrase is read to be any molecule comprising a closed ring structure. In response to this rejection, Applicant indicates that but for the term "flexible" being in the phrase, the Examiner's reading is correct. In view of this rejection Applicant has deleted term "flexible" from this phrase. Applicant asserts that the phrase as amended "cyclic molecules" does comprise any closed ring structure.

Next, the Examiner rejected claims 1 - 10 under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over Cohen in view of Lien et al. In making this rejection, the Examiner indicated that it would be obvious of one of ordinary skill in the art to take the method of Cohen and modify the liquid composition to that taught by Lien et al because Cohen teaches the requirements for a material to be a suitable conformable contact mask and the material taught by Lien meets those criteria. The Examiner further notes that Lien et al. declare the suitability of their material for electrical applications, specifically encapsulation. Contrary to the Examiner's assertion, one of skill in the art would not combine the material of Lien et al. with the process of Cohen to achieve the present invention. The materials of the inventions of independent claims 1 and 6 are to be patterned by laser ablation. More particularly, the claims as amended require the material to be patterned by laser ablation using UV radiation. Lien et al. do not ablate their material or teach that the material is laser ablatable and more particularly that it is ablatable by UV laser radiation. As such, those of skill in the art would not combine the material of Lien et al. with the process of Cohen so as to form a conformable contact mask via ablation of a flexible member using UV laser radiation. Reconsideration of this rejection is requested

Lastly, the Examiner rejected claims 6 - 10 under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over Cohen in view of Lee et al. In making this rejection, the Examiner noted that the material taught by Lee clearly meets the requirements of Cohen and one of ordinary skill would be motivated to use this elastomer in the method taught by Cohen. Contrary to the Examiner's assertion, one of skill in the art would not combine the material of Lee with the process of Cohen to achieve the present invention. As noted above the, the material of the invention of independent claim 6 is to be patterned by laser ablation. More particularly, the claim as amended requires the material to be patterned by laser ablation using UV radiation. Lee et al. do not ablate their material or teach that the material is laser ablatable and more particularly that it is ablatable by UV laser radiation. As such, those of skill in the art would not combine the material of Lee et al. with the process of Cohen so as to form a conformable contact mask via ablation of a flexible member using UV laser radiation. Reconsideration of this rejection is requested.

As the remaining claims depend from either claim 1 or claim 6 and as these base claims are not anticipated by or made obvious by any combination of the references of record, it is believed that these dependent claims are allowable.

In view of the amendments and remarks, the application is believed to be in condition for allowance and reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections and passage to allowance is earnestly solicited. If any questions should arise concerning this application or if it would otherwise be useful to discuss this application, please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned by phone.

Microfabrica Inc.
7911 Haskell Avenue
Van Nuys, CA 91406
Ph: (818) 786-3322, ext. 105
Fx: (818) 997-3659

Respectfully submitted,



Dennis R. Smalley
Reg. No. 35,364